

If the Expedient you have proposed, that the Tax upon the uncultivated Lands may not fall upon any other Part of the Owner's Estate, would succeed, it would be a most excellent one; as we should then have all the Land taken up in the Province, cultivated and improved; but you must see, that if your Expedient would not have that Effect, our Objection would not be answered, because, though the Property might be changed, still the Proprietor would be liable to the Hardship we mentioned.

What you have said of the Tenant's Power to retain has been already observed upon. The Oath appointed to be taken by the Clerk of the Commissioners of the Loan Office, had it been confined to his own Conduct, we should not have objected to: It appears to us, that by the Oath, as it now stands, he is to swear for the Commissioners. Whether there was the same Impropriety in the Oath prescribed by the 40,000 *l.* Act, or whether it has been occasioned by the Variation you have made, is immaterial; if it is wrong, it ought to be altered.

We can't think it just and right to make Sureties, for the faithful Performance of one Duty, liable, without their Consent, for any Breach of a new Engagement.

We must confess, we can't discover that Resemblance between your Bill and any of the Land-Tax Acts, you seem to think, with respect to the Assessors; and that the unlimited Power, not only of Judging, but even Guessing, which you have vested them with (we think) might be attended with much Inconvenience.

Your Remark upon our Objection to that Part of the Bill, by which all the Plate and Ready Money in every Person's Possession, is to be discovered to all the Inhabitants of the County wherein such Person may reside, would have been prevented, if you had not thought proper to split it for the Convenience of framing your Answer.

Our Objection was, that few prudent Men would chuse to publish to all the Inhabitants of the Counties they live in, or even to their Domestic Servants, all their Plate and Ready Money, as it might be too great an Encouragement to Rapine.

You Remark upon this, that Ready Money laying at Hazard, should be put into Circulation.

"If there be Quantities of Plate, so hidden from the World, by any Person, that even his Domesticks are unacquainted with it, it is become an useless Treasure, and it is Time it should some Way be rendered useful to the Community, though the Owner may not chuse to use it himself."

We don't suppose you mean, that it would be better to have Ready Money, or Plate Stolen, than that the Owner should do what he pleases with it; but we can't conceive why a Discovery made by your Bill might not be as dangerous as by any other Method; however, you'll be pleased to observe, that we did not speak of Quantities of Plate hidden from Domesticks, whatever you have been pleased to make us say.

As you have intimated to us, that the Military Parts of the Bill may probably be amended to our Satisfaction, if we don't think our Objections have been obviated by your Answers, it will be sufficient, on this Head, to observe to you, that your Answers are very Unsatisfactory.

We are well pleased to find, that unnecessary Obstructions to the Passage of the Journals of Accounts will not, for the future, be thrown in; and that you are now convinced, they can't promote the Interest of your Constituents.

Your Hint, that you expect the Assembly will set by the last of *September*, would have been more proper to the Governor, who is the only Judge of that Matter. We believe we may say, that if an Assembly at that Time shall appear to his Excellency to be necessary it will then sit; but if not, he will not be inclined to add to the Public Debt.

As to the Tax upon Lord *Baltimore's* Estate, in the Manner you would impose it, it does not appear to us to be so certainly just and reasonable as you seem to think.

All his Real Estate, except his Quit Rents, we have agreed shall be Taxed; but the Quit-Rents we think are upon a very different Footing from the rest of his Estate, and that his Lordship would have good Reasons to object to any Imposition upon them; and we shall only add to what we said in our former Message, that whatever Probability you may think there is of the Quit-Rents of the Proprietary of *Pennsylvania* being Taxed, from the Intelligence you may have received, we are unacquainted with it, and that it can't at present have much Weight with us.

The Quit-Rents reserved in the old Grants, whether there was any Purchase-Money paid or not (in many Instances you know nothing was paid) was, we presume, thought to be as much as the Proprietary deemed it prudent to demand of his Tenants, who had many Difficulties to struggle with, and would be put to a great Expence in Supporting the Government, and Defending the Province. But, can it be seriously contended, that after the Province was well settled, and Lands grew valuable, he could not, with Justice, alter the Terms of his future Grants, in Proportion to their Increase of Value? Had his Lordship attempted to